UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,652	05/09/2006	Peter Ferdinand Greve	NL 031312	1789
	7590	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 300	1	AKANBI, ISIAKA O		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2886	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	,		11/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/578,652	GREVE ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
•		Isiaka O. Akanbi	2886		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS ansions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMUN 6(a). In no event, however, may a ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MC cause the application to become A	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	•				
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 May 2006</u> .				
· —	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)∐	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	х рапе Quayle, 1935 С.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Applicati	on Papers				
10)🛛	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 May 2006</u> is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction to drawing sheet(s) including the correction to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	☑ accepted or b)☐ object awing(s) be held in abeyation is required if the drawing	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application		

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Preliminary Amendment

The preliminary amendment filed on 09 May 2006 has been entered into this application.

Drawings

The drawings filed on 09 May 2006, has been accepted for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MacDonald et al. (6,195,159 B1).

Regarding claim 1, MacDonald discloses a method of determining the focus of an optical system comprising of the following:

- arranging the optical system (fig. 1A: 5) between an illumination system (fig. 1A: 100) and a radiation-sensitive detection system (fig.1A: 105);
- arranging a test object (fig. 1A: 101) between the illumination system (fig. 1A: 100) and the optical system (fig. 1: 5);

10/578,652

Art Unit: 2886

- imaging the test object (fig. 1A: 101) by means of the optical system (fig. 1A: 5) on the detection system (fig. 1A: 105)(see abstract), and

establishing the position of the focal plane from the modulation depth of the test object image, characterized in that the step of arranging a test object comprises arranging a first test object (111, 112 or 113) between the illumination system (fig. 1A: 100) and the expected focal plane of the optical system and a second test object (111, 112 or 113) between this plane and the optical system system (fig. 1A: 5), whereby the first and second test objects are arranged at different locations with respect to the optical axis of the optical system (col. 9, lines 4-32), and in that the step of establishing focus comprises determining the modulation depth of each of the two test object images and subtracting the obtained modulation depth values from each other to obtain a difference value, which represents the position of focus with respect to the positions of the two test objects (col. 2, lines 45-col. 3, line 3).

As to claim 2, MacDonald further discloses the limitation wherein the focus is determined at different points in the field of view of the imaging system (fig. 1A: 105)(col. 10, line 3)(fig. 11)(col. 1, lines 55-65)(col. 9, lines 8-18).

As to claim 3, MacDonald discloses an apparatus for determining focus of an optical system comprising of the following:

a radiation source (fig. 1A: 100) for supplying an illumination beam, a test object (fig. 1A: 101), a location for the optical system (fig. 1A: 5) to be measured, a radiation-sensitive detection system (fig. 1A: 105) and processing means (fig. 2: 4) for processing signals from the detection system, characterized in that the test object comprises two sub-objects (fig. 5: 111, 112 or 113), which are arranged at different sides of the expected best focus of the optical system and at different locations with respect to the axis of the apparatus, in that the radiation-sensitive detection system (CCD arrays) comprises separate detection areas for the images of the sub-

objects and in that the processing means (fig. 2: 4) comprises means for calculating (MTF) the difference in contrast of the images (col. 1, lines 27-28)(col. 17, lines 56-col. 18, line 24)(figs. 7 and 8C).

As to claims 4-5, MacDonald also discloses the target pattern 101 comprises an opaque metallic substrate which includes a plurality of features 110, such as apertures, or slits, passing therethrough and arranged in a target pattern (applicant's grating) which is back-illuminated by the light source 100 such that light passes through the features 110. Alternately, a glass substrate (applicant's transparent plate) may be used. In this case, a glass substrate is masked by a substantially opaque background region, which prevents light from the light source 100 from reaching the detector 105. The features 110 may then be formed in the masked opaque background, e.g. by a photo-etching process which is well known (col. 8, lines 41-51), meeting the applicant limitations that the sub-objects are gratings and that the gratings are arranged at the front side and the rear side, respectively of a transparent plate.

As to claim 6, MacDonald further discloses the limitation of an additional lens system that is arranged between the optical system and the sub-object that is most close to the optical system (col. 9, lines 45-50).

Additional Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references listed in the attached form PTO-892 teach of other prior art method of determining the focus of an optical system that may anticipate or obviate the claims of the applicant's invention.

Application/Control Number:

10/578,652

Art Unit: 2886

Page 5

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Isiaka Akanbi whose telephone number is (571) 272-8658. The examiner

can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tarifur R. Chowdhury can be reached on (571) 272-2287. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Isiaka Akanbi

November 13, 2007

RIFUR CHOWDHURY

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER